LIBRARY COPY

THEOSOPHY

A MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY

THE STUDY OF OCCULT SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY, AND ARYAN LITERATURE

Vol. XXXIX—No. 4 **February, 1951**

WITH *the principle of* SIMILARITY OF AIM, PURPOSE, AND TEACHING *as basis for union, no possible cause for differences could arise; no room is found here for leader or authority, for dogma or superstition, and yet—as there are stores of knowledge left for all—the right spirit must bring forth from "Those who never fail" all necessary assistance. The door seems open for those who* WOULD, *but cannot see a way. Any considerable number,* LIVING, THINKING, ACTING, UPON THIS BASIS, *must form a spiritual focus, from which all things are possible. The motto: "Be Theosophists; work for Theosophy."*

THE WAY TO UNITE IS TO UNITE—NOTHING PREVENTS IF THAT IS THE DESIRE.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

CONTENTS

THE SEVENTH SEVEN....145
FROM "THE ESOTERIC CHARACTER OF THE GOSPELS"....148
THE ABSTRACTION OF KNOWLEDGE....155
REINCARNATION OF ANIMALS....159
FREE-WILL AND NECESSITY....162
"DISCERNMENT AND CRITICISM"....167
YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— 168
H.P.B. ON KABBALISTIC INTERPRETATION....171
"THE GITA"—INFORMAL ESSAYS....175
COINCIDENCE....179
ON THE LOOKOUT....181

$3.50 per Annum *35 Cents per Copy*

Edited and Published by

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles (7), California, U.S.A.

Publisher's Announcements

THEOSOPHY: Established November, 1912, by Robert Crosbie. Published monthly by the Theosophy Company, at Los Angeles, California, U. S. A. This Magazine is an independent Journal, unconnected with any theosophical society or other organization. The Publishers assume full responsibility for all unsigned articles herein.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: No subscriptions are accepted for less than one year of 12 numbers, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All subscriptions, orders for single back numbers, and back volumes, bound or unbound, should be accompanied by the necessary remittance. Price $3.50 per annum; single numbers of the current volume, 35 cents each; back numbers, 50 cents each; back volumes, unbound, $5.00 each; for library style binding, prices on request. *Volumes I and XII are out of print.*

COMMUNICATIONS: Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten double-spaced on one side of the paper only, with wide margins, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

CORRESPONDENCE: Letters from subscribers and readers are welcomed, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of the magazine.

BEQUESTS AND DONATIONS: Gifts and legacies will be gladly received from those in sympathy with the objects of this Magazine when such benefactions are unencumbered and unrestricted. Donors should make their gifts to

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY, of Los Angeles, California, U. S. A. which is an incorporated association, legally empowered to receive such donations and bequests in furtherance of its objects. These objects are:

(a) To form the nucleus of a universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color;

(b) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study; and

(c) The investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY
245 West 33rd Street
Los Angeles (7), California, U. S. A.

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS,
"Maitri-Bhavan"
15, Sir Krishna Rao Road,
Basavangudi Bangalore City.

A U M

LIBRARY COPY

The holy aspiration is the bow, self the arrow, the Eternal they call the mark; it is to be pierced with steady aim; let the self, arrow-like, become one with the mark.
—*Mundaka Upanishad*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXXIX **February, 1951** **No. 4**

THE SEVENTH SEVEN

FORTY-TWO years ago, on February 18, 1909, Robert Crosbie and a few associates adopted the *Declaration* of "The United Lodge of Theosophists," thus endowing with a life of its own "an Association of Theosophists irrespective of organization, who are bound together by the tie of common aim, purpose and teaching, in the cause of Theosophy." The explanatory statement issued at the time can be read and reread with profit by present-day associates of U.L.T., for it epitomizes the life-work of Mr. Crosbie and is by way of being a legacy to all theosophists—through him—from his teachers, H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge, founders of the Theosophical Movement of 1875. The United Lodge of Theosophists, Mr. Crosbie declares, is an integral part of that Theosophical Movement—a statement that can be checked and verified by every open-minded theosophist who perseveres, under the triple aegis of Unity-Study-Work, with the cause of Theosophy at heart. Two further sentences from this primary announcement show the line taken by the original associates:

> Theosophy, being the origin, basis and genius of every Theosophical organization, forms in itself a common ground of interest and effort, above and beyond all differences of opinion as to persons or methods; and being the philosophy of Unity, it calls for the essential union of those who profess and promulgate it.
>
> This Union does not mean a sameness of organization or method, but a friendly recognition, mutual assistance and encouragement among all engaged in the furtherance of Theosophy.

The "essential union" to be realized by theosophical students is, if the expression be permitted, an ideal that *grows,* since the Association of students at all times includes three classes of mem-

bers. The first are those who, without turning aside or back, have adopted the principles of the Declaration as guides, correctives, and inspiration for the *whole* of their existence, for life and for lives. Second are those who are attempting impersonality, on the basis of the Declaration; who often, perhaps for long periods at a time, find themselves able to work in mutual friendship and encouragement with their fellow-theosophists; and who reduce the length and frequency of cycles of "obscuration" by resolute control of the vestigial organs of personality, pride, and prejudice. Third come those to whom the Declaration makes a deep appeal, as holding forth a basis for union that harbors no ulterior assaults on integrity or moral freedom; they see independence and interdependence subtly joined, and they set themselves to fathom the working of an association which has no officers, leaders, by-laws, or dues, which is in fact a joint enterprise "without visible means of support."

The "essential union"—sought out by new associates, attempted by others, and realized by some—is ever-becoming, for as the plan and program of the theosophical movement is carried into the lives of those who profess and promulgate Theosophy, more and more men, women and children discover the common ground of interest and effort provided by the philosophy.

A second point in Mr. Crosbie's explanation of U.L.T. is that the idea of successorship drastically interferes with the student's perspective of the Theosophical Movement. An early series of chapters from theosophical history, entitled "Masters and their Message," published in this Magazine (June, 1914, et ff.), contains a key statement in this regard: "Let those, then, who would understand the Theosophical Movement, Theosophy, and its Messengers, consider that it might be true that the persons known in the world as H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge, were but the mortal garment assumed by beings of a higher order; let Their writings be studied from this point of view, and it is certain that a great light will dawn, where before there was darkness and confusion." It is to some degree useless to expect that delusions of and about "successorship" can be destroyed out of hand by either logical analysis or fervent declarations. The *impossibility* of successorship must first be grasped. To this end, what better means could be chosen than the consideration above set forth?

If H.P.B. and W.Q.J. were more than their mortal garments, They neither began their efforts upon assuming perishable masks, nor ceased their work when the time came for relinquishing the temporary vehicles that served their purposes in the cycle of 1875. Their efforts and work, as beings of a higher order, may be noticed or not, appreciated or not, emulated or not, but it would be a rash, foolish and ignorant man who would assert that their places in the theosophical movement could be taken by any other beings soever. To imagine so would be to believe that the two known as H.P.B. and W.Q.J. had stopped working, had changed the purposes they unswervingly followed in the stormy years they spent visibly among men of the nineteenth century. Such an absurdity could not be entertained by one convinced of the soul's immortality, much less by the mind that has grasped even the first implications of the doctrine of perfected men.

The position of U.L.T. with respect to H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge, Mr. Crosbie explains, is "that both were great Teachers —each with a particular mission—that each was *sui generis,* that their work was complementary, and that neither of them had, nor could have, any successor." In this is to be understood a further fact: that neither H.P.B. nor W.Q.J. *need* a successor. Those among their students and disciples who develop in themselves strength to be *sui generis,* in the theosophical sense; who are content if their work is complementary to that of their fellows; who find their own place and fill it devotedly, unperturbed by the way someone else conducts his "particular mission"—these will desire neither to succeed (meaning *supplant*) a co-student, nor to raise themselves a crop of imitative "successors."

By reason of its aim and purpose, its promulgation of the teachings of Theosophy pure and simple, and its faithfulness not to the memory but to the spirit, life, and work of the Teachers, U.L.T. stands on an unassailable basis. It certifies neither personalities nor authorities, but only the "lines laid down." It provides security for those who seek it in the combination of a soul-satisfying philosophy and soul-evoking work for humanity. Entering a cycle of fulfillment, the seventh seven in its years, U.L.T. will yet be—until 1975—a promise unfulfilled, a goal but partly realized.

FROM "THE ESOTERIC CHARACTER OF THE GOSPELS"

[The question, "Are the Teachings ascribed to Jesus contradictory?" having been raised by a contributor in *Lucifer* for October, 1887, H. P. Blavatsky, the following month, opened a new series of articles on "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels." Giving "chapter and verse" for her statements. H.P.B. disclosed the philosophy —the esoteric truths—concealed under dogma, ritual, and literal application of *distorted* Scriptures. The series continued for only three installments, although a fourth was promised. The entire series has already been reprinted in THEOSOPHY (IV, 32, 61, and 134), but a new generation of THEOSOPHY readers will be glad to have available the most cogent sections, which will be republished in this and next month's issue. Extended technical quotations and deductions are here omitted, Greek words transliterated, and Latin phrases translated where necessary. What remains are the powerful declarations of esoteric philosophy, as contrasted with the dead-letter of Christian dogmas, and certain remarkable prophecies which the present "cycle of psychism" has already fulfilled. —Eds. THEOSOPHY.]

". . . . Tell us, when shall these things be? And what shall be the sign *of thy presence,* and of the consummation of the age?"* asked the Disciples of the MASTER, on the Mount of Olives.

THE reply given by the "Man of Sorrow," the *Chrestos,* on his trial, but also on his way to triumph, as *Christos,* or Christ,† is prophetic, and very suggestive. It is a warning indeed. The answer must be quoted in full. Jesus . . . said unto them:—

"Take heed that *no man* lead you astray. For many shall come in my name saying, I am the Christ; and shall lead many astray. And ye shall hear of wars . . . but the end is not yet. *For nation shall*

---

*St. Matthew xxiv., 3, *et seq.* The sentences italicised are those which stand corrected in the New Testament after the recent revision in 1881 of the version of *1611;* which version is full of errors, voluntary and involuntary. The word "presence," for "coming," and "the consummation of the age," now standing for "the end of the world," have altered, of late, the whole meaning, even for the most sincere Christians, if we except the Adventists.

†He who will not ponder over and master the great difference between the meaning of the two Greek words—*chrestos* and *christos*—must remain blind for ever to the true esoteric meaning of the Gospels; that is to say, to the living Spirit entombed in the sterile dead-letter of the texts, the very Dead Sea fruit of *lip*-Christianity.

rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be famines and earthquakes in divers places. But all these things are the beginning of travail. . . . Many false prophets shall arise, and shall lead many astray . . . then shall the end come . . . when ye see the abomination of desolation which was spoken through Daniel. . . . Then if any man shall say unto you, *Lo, here is the Christ,* or there; believe him not. . . . If they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the wilderness, go not forth: behold, he is in the inner chambers, believe them not. For as the lightning cometh forth from the East, and is seen even in the West, so shall be the *presence* of the Son of Man," etc., etc.

Two things become evident *to all* in the above passages, now that their false rendering is corrected in the revision text: *(a)* "the coming of Christ," means *the presence of* CHRISTOS in a regenerated world, and not at all the actual coming in body of "Christ" Jesus; *(b)* this Christ is to be sought neither in the wilderness nor "in the inner chambers," nor in the sanctuary of any temple or Church built by man; for Christ—the true esoteric SAVIOUR—*is no man,* but the DIVINE PRINCIPLE in every human being. He who strives to resurrect the Spirit *crucified in him by his own terrestrial passions,* and buried deep in the "sepulchre" of his sinful flesh; he who has the strength to roll back *the stone of matter* from the door of his own *inner* sanctuary, he *has the risen Christ* in him.* The "Son of Man" is no child of the bond-woman—*flesh,* but verily of the free-woman—Spirit,† the child of man's own deeds, and the fruit of his own spiritual labour.

On the other hand, at no time since the Christian era, have the precursor signs described in *Matthew* applied so graphically and forcibly to any epoch as they do to our own times. When has nation arisen against nation more than at this time? When have "famines" —another name for destitute pauperism, and the famished multitudes of the proletariat—been more cruel, earthquakes more frequent, or covered such an area simultaneously, as for the last few years? Millenarians and Adventists of robust faith, may go on saying that "the

---

*For ye are the temple ("sanctuary" in the *revised* N.T.) of the living God. (II. Cor. vi, 16.)

†Spirit, or the Holy Ghost, was feminine with the Jews, as with most ancient peoples, and it was so with the early Christians. *Sophia* of the Gnostics, and the third Sephiroth *Binah* (the *female* Jehovah of the Kabalists), are feminine principles —"Divine Spirit," or *Ruach. "Achath Ruach Elohim Chiim."* "One is *She,* the Spirit of the Elohim of Life," is said in *Sepher Yezirah.*

coming of [the carnalised] Christ" is near at hand, and prepare themselves for "the end of the world." Theosophists—at any rate, some of them—who understand the hidden meaning of the universally-expected Avatars, Messiahs, Sosioshes and Christs—know that it is no "end of the world," but "the consummation of the age," *i.e.*, the close of a cycle, which is now fast approaching.* If our readers have forgotten the concluding passages of the article, "The Signs of the Times," in *Lucifer* for October last,† let them read them over, and they will plainly see the meaning of this particular cycle.

Many and many a time the warning about the "false Christs" and prophets who shall lead people astray has been interpreted by charitable Christians, the worshippers of the dead-letter of their scripture, as applying to mystics generally, and Theosophists most especially. . . . Nevertheless, it seems very evident that the words in Matthew's Gospel and others can hardly apply to Theosophists. For these were never found saying that Christ is "Here" or "There," in wilderness or city, and least of all in the "inner chamber" behind the altar of any modern church. Whether Heathen or Christian by birth, they refuse to materialise and thus degrade that which is the purest and grandest ideal—the symbol of symbols—namely, the immortal Divine Spirit in man, whether it be called Horus, Krishna, Buddha, or Christ. None of them has ever yet said: "I am the Christ"; for those born in the West feel themselves, so far, only *Chrestians*,‡ however much they may strive to become Christians in Spirit. It is to those, who in their great conceit and pride refuse to win the right of such appellation by first leading the life of *Chrestos;* to those who haughtily proclaim themselves *Christians* (the glorified, the anointed) by sole virtue of baptism when but a few days old—that the above-quoted words of Jesus apply most forcibly. Can the prophetic insight of him who uttered this remarkable warning be doubted by

---

*There are several remarkable cycles that come to a close at the end of this century. First, the 5,000 years of the Kaliyug cycle; again the Messianic cycle of the Samaritan (also Kabalistic) Jews of the man connected with *Pisces* (Ichthys or "Fish-man" *Dag*). It is a cycle, historic and not very long, but very occult, lasting about 2,155 solar years, but having a true significance only when computed by lunar months. It occurred 2410 and 255 B.C., or when the equinox entered into the sign of the *Ram*, and again into that of *Pisces*. When it enters, in a few years, the sign of *Aquarius*, psychologists will have some extra work to do, and the psychic idiosyncrasies of humanity will enter on a great change.

†Reprinted in THEOSOPHY XXXIX, 5 (November, 1950).—Eds. THEOSOPHY.

‡The earliest Christian author, Justin Martyr, calls, in his first Apology, his co-religionists *Chrestians* [Chrestianoi]—not Christians.

any one who sees the numerous "false prophets" and pseudo-apostles *(of Christ),* now roaming over the world? These have split the one divine Truth into fragments, and broken, in the camp of the Protestants alone, the rock of the Eternal Verity into three hundred and fifty odd pieces, which now represent the bulk of their Dissenting sects. Accepting the number in round figures as 350, and admitting, for argument's sake, that, at least, one of these may have the approximate truth, still 349 *must be necessarily false.* Each of these claims to have Christ exclusively in its "inner chamber," and denies him in all others, while in truth, the great majority of their respective followers daily put Christ to death on the cruciform tree of matter —the "tree of infamy" of the old Romans—indeed!

The worship of the dead-letter in the Bible is but one more form of *idolatry,* nothing better. A fundamental dogma of faith cannot exist under a double-faced Janus form. "Justification" *by Christ* cannot be achieved at one's choice and fancy, *either* by "faith" or by "works," and James, therefore (ii., 25), contradicting Paul (Heb. xi., 31), and *vice versa,** one of them must be wrong. Hence, the Bible is *not* the "Word of God," but contains at best the words of fallible men and *imperfect* teachers. Yet read *esoterically,* it does contain, if not the *whole* truth, still, "nothing but the truth," under whatever allegorical garb. Only: *Quot homines tot sententiae.* ["So many men, so many opinions."]

The "Christ principle," the awakened and glorified Spirit of Truth, being universal and eternal, the true *Christos* cannot be monopolized by any one person, even though that person has chosen to arrogate to himself the title of the "Vicar of Christ," or of the "Head" of that or another State-religion. The spirits of "Chrest" and "Christ" cannot be confined to any creed or sect, only because that sect chooses to exalt itself above the heads of all other religions or sects. The name has been used in a manner so intolerant and dogmatic, especially in our day, that Christianity is now the religion of arrogance *par*

*It is but fair to St. Paul to remark that this contradiction is surely due to later tampering with his Epistles. Paul was a Gnostic himself, i.e., a "Son of Wisdom," and an Initiate into the true *mysteries of Christos,* though he may have thundered (or was made to appear to do so) against some Gnostic sects, of which, in his day, there were many. But his Christos was not Jesus of Nazareth, nor any living man, as shown so ably in Mr. Gerald Massey's lecture, "Paul, the Gnostic Opponent of Peter." He was an Initiate, a true "Master-Builder" or adept, as described in *Isis Unveiled,* Vol. II, pp. 90-91.

excellence, a stepping-stone for ambition, a sinecure for wealth, sham and power; a convenient screen for hypocrisy. The noble epithet of old, the one that made Justin Martyr say that *"from the mere name,* which is imputed to us as a crime, *we are the most excellent" (First Apology),* is now degraded. The missionary prides himself with the so-called *conversion* of a heathen, who makes of Christianity ever a *profession,* but rarely a religion, a source of income from the missionary fund, and a pretext, since the blood of Jesus has washed them all by anticipation, for every petty crime, from drunkenness and lying up to theft. That same missionary, however, would not hesitate to publicly condemn the greatest saint to eternal perdition and hell fires if that holy man has only neglected to pass through the fruitless and meaningless form of baptism by water with accompaniment of *lip* prayers and vain ritualism.

We say "lip prayer" and "vain ritualism" knowingly. Few Christians among the laymen are aware even of the true meaning of the word *Christ;* and those of the clergy who happen to know it (for they are brought up in the idea that to study such subjects is *sinful*) keep the information secret from their parishioners. They demand blind, implicit faith, and *forbid inquiry as the one unpardonable sin,* though nothing of that which leads to the knowledge of the truth can be aught else than holy. For what is "Divine Wisdom," or *Gnosis,* but the essential reality behind the evanescent appearances of objects in nature—the very soul of the manifested LOGOS? Why should men who strive to accomplish union with the one eternal and absolute Deity shudder at the idea of prying into its mysteries —however awful? Why, above all, should they use names and words the very meaning of which is a sealed mystery to them—a mere sound? Is it because an unscrupulous, power-seeking Establishment called a Church has cried "wolf" at every such attempt, and, denouncing it as "blasphemous," has ever tried to kill the spirit of inquiry? But Theosophy, the "divine Wisdom," has never heeded that cry, and has the courage of its opinions. The world of sceptics and fanatics may call it, one—an empty *"ism,"* the other—"Satanism": they can never crush it.

Theosophists have been called Atheists, haters of Christianity, the enemies of God and the gods. They are none of these. Therefore, they have agreed this day to publish a clear statement of their

ideas, and a profession of their faith—with regard to monotheism and Christianity, at any rate—and to place it before the impartial reader to judge them and their detractors on the merits of their respective faiths. No truth-loving mind would object to such honest and sincere dealing, nor will it be dazzled by any amount of new light thrown upon the subject, howsoever much startled otherwise. On the contrary, such minds will thank *Lucifer* perhaps, while those of whom it was said *"qui vult decipi decipiatur"**—let them be deceived by all means!

The editors of this magazine propose to give a series of essays upon the hidden meaning or esotericism of the "New Testament." No more than any other scripture of the great world-religions can the Bible be excluded from that class of allegorical and symbolical writings which have been, from the pre-historic ages, the receptacle of the secret teachings of the Mysteries of Initiation, under a more or less veiled form. The primitive writers of the *Logia* (now the Gospels) knew certainly *the* truth, and the *whole* truth; but their successors had, as certainly, only dogma and form, which lead to hierarchical power at heart, rather than the spirit of the so-called Christ's teachings. Hence the gradual perversion. As Higgins truly said, in the Christologia of St. Paul and Justin Martyr, we have the esoteric religion of the Vatican, a refined Gnosticism for the cardinals, a more gross one for the people. It is the latter, only still more materialized and disfigured, which has reached us in our age. * * *

If, indeed, the Bible is forced on the acceptance of the world in its dead-letter meaning, in the face of the modern discoveries by Orientalists and the efforts of independent students and kabalists, it is easy to prophesy that even the present new generations of Europe and America will repudiate it, as all the materialists and logicians have done. For the more one studies ancient religious texts, the more one finds that the ground-work of the New Testament is the same as the ground-work of the Vedas, of the Egyptian theogony, and the Mazdean allegories. * * *

The mystic meaning of . . . "Verily I say unto you, except *ye eat the flesh* of the Son of man and *drink his blood,* ye have not life in your-

*"Who wants to be deceived, let him be deceived."—Eds. THEOSOPHY.

selves," &c., can never be understood or appreciated at its true *occult* value, except by those who hold some of the *seven keys,* and yet care little for St. Peter.* These words, whether said by Jesus of Nazareth, or Jeshua Ben-Panthera, are the words of an INITIATE. They have to be interpreted with the help of *three* keys—one opening the *psychic* door, the second that of physiology, and the third that which unlocks the mystery of terrestrial being, by unveiling the inseparable blending of theogony with anthropology. It is for revealing a few of these truths, with the *sole view of saving intellectual mankind from the insanities of materialism and pessimism,* that mystics have often been denounced as the servants of Antichrist, even by those Christians who are most worthy, sincerely pious and respectable men.

* * * We may learn from the Gospel *according* to Luke, that the "worthy" were . . . initiated into the mysteries of the Gnosis. . . . In other words, they were the great adepts of *whatever religion;* and the words apply to all those who, without being Initiates, strive and succeed through personal efforts to *live the life* and to attain the naturally ensuing spiritual illumination in blending their personality—the ("Son")—with (the "Father"), their individual divine Spirit, *the God within* them. This "resurrection" can never be monopolized by the Christians, but is the spiritual birth-right of every human being endowed with soul and spirit, whatever his religion may be. Such individual is a *Christ-man.* On the other hand, those who choose to ignore the Christ (principle) within themselves, must die *unregenerate heathen*—baptism, sacraments, lip-prayers, and belief in dogmas notwithstanding. * * *

H.P.B.

---

*The existence of these *seven* keys is virtually admitted owing to deep research in the Egyptological lore, by Mr. G. Massey again. While opposing the teachings of *Esoteric Buddhism*—unfortunately misunderstood by him in almost every respect—in his Lecture on "The Seven Souls of Man," he writes (p. 21):—

"This system of thought, this mode of representation, this septenary of powers, in various aspects, had been established in Egypt, at least, seven thousand years ago, as we learn from certain allusions to Atum (the god 'in whom the fatherhood was individualised as the *begetter of an eternal soul,*' the *seventh* principle of the Theosophists), found in the inscriptions lately discovered at Sakarah. I say in various aspects, *because the gnosis of the Mysteries was, at least, sevenfold in its nature*—it was Elemental, Biological, Elementary (human), Stellar, Lunar, Solar and Spiritual—and *nothing short of a grasp of the whole system can possibly enable us to discriminate the various parts, distinguish one from the other, and determinate the which and the what, as we try to follow the symbolical Seven through their several phases of character.*"

THE ABSTRACTION OF KNOWLEDGE

THE propositions of Patanjali, Mr. Judge writes in his preface to the Aphorisms, imply that the will and the mind are only servants for the soul's use, and that knowledge exists as an abstraction. It has sometimes puzzled his readers to know in what sense the word "abstraction" is used. Is Mr. Judge saying that knowledge exists as an abstract entity, all by itself, so to speak? Are we to think of knowledge as literally having a "life" of its own? What of the familiar maxim that knowledge cannot exist without the knowers of it?

Perhaps to correlate the Patanjali statement with another view of how knowledge exists will be useful. Take the concluding paragraph from the first chapter of Mr. Judge's *Ocean of Theosophy:*

> I repeat then, that though the true doctrine disappears for a time from among men it is bound to reappear, because first, it is impacted in the imperishable center of man's nature; and secondly, the Lodge forever preserves it, not only in actual objective records, but also in the intelligent and fully self-conscious men who, having successfully overpassed the many periods of evolution which preceded this one we are now involved in, cannot lose the precious possessions they have acquired. . . .

Here knowledge exists imperishably in three forms: in man's highest nature, in objective records, and as self-consciously possessed by perfected men. The great ideas of the wisdom-religion—the theosophical fundamentals constantly stressed by H. P. Blavatsky in the latest "objective records" accessible to humanity—are taught the human race in the beginning, in somewhat the same sense (we may imagine) as that in which the plan for a new evolutionary cycle is "laid down in universal mind." The plan is not a new creation, but the development of the preceding period of evolution, a natural extension of the experience gained. So with the "inherent ideas." They represent the assimilated knowledge gained in prior cycles, and since each Ego acquires knowledge not simply for his own sake, but as part of the collective or universal mind, each period of withdrawal from manifestation finds all souls—and the knowledge of all souls—united. Coming forth again, each being occupies

that step on the ladder of being to which his degree of acquired individuality has brought him. Yet since each soul proclaims a fundamental identity with the Universal Over-Soul, the beings who were self-conscious knowers in the opening cycle of the present evolution could impress all minds with the guiding conceptions that form the "plan laid down."

A definition of Nature given by H. P. Blavatsky in her *Secret Doctrine* (I, 277-8) will show how Beings, forces, forms, and Law are correlated in theosophic philosophy: Nature taken in its abstract sense, H.P.B. writes, "is in reality an aggregate of forces manipulated by semi-intelligent beings (Elementals) guided by High Planetary Spirits (Dhyan Chohans), whose collective aggregate forms the manifested *verbum* of the unmanifested LOGOS, and constitutes at one and the same time the MIND of the Universe and its immutable LAW." This statement itself is an "aggregate of abstractions" for the human mind, yet as we become familiar with the workings of the law of analogy and correspondence, the several factors in H.P.B.'s abstruse equation gradually open themselves to our understanding.

The first step toward understanding may be to accept the *necessity* for abstractions, which means to let go of the notion that the explanation of life, nature, and man can be given in concrete intellectual terms. In this endeavor, H.P.B. encourages her students by pointing out the limitations of the human intellect, while simultaneously affirming that the human spirit, free of attachment to forms, names, and things, can realize the immutable laws at work in these aspects of manifestation. "Man, unable to form one concept except in terms of empirical phenomena, is powerless from the very constitution of his being to raise the veil that shrouds the majesty of the Absolute," the *Secret Doctrine* states (I, 51). "Only the liberated Spirit is able to faintly realise the nature of the source whence it sprung and whither it must eventually return."

Greatest attest of H.P.B.'s faith in man's capacity to develop the higher perceptive faculties latent in his being, is her statement of the Three Fundamental Propositions, at the opening of the *S.D.* Who knows the powers brought into activity by repeated attention to these propositions—even though unfathomable deeps exist in each of them? Evolution, it is said, starts at the top, with the descent of

Spirit; understanding, we may imagine, begins in the same way. Striving to encompass the basic propositions without dwarfing them inside human conceptions and expression, the student reaches for the most profound abstractions his mind is capable of entertaining. Returning from that high point, the mind's inner senses still awake, the Ego looks upon the phenomena of this world from the other side, perceiving for a time the "secret doctrine" of their laws and causes, instead of their transient forms and effects. These journeys to higher spheres through "study" of the Fundamentals disclose to us the reasons why "these abstractions must of necessity be postulated as the cause of the material Universe which presents itself to the senses and intellect," and why "metaphysical abstractions are the only conceivable cause of physical concretions." (*S.D.* I, 44-5.)

The cause of form must be itself formless; the origin of names must be the nameless, the Word, and ultimately, the unmanifested Word or Logos. The source of matter, force and energy is immaterial; it cannot operate as a force, or extend itself as an energy—it remains the source, unmodified by its emanations, which are all contained within *It.* But even the metaphysical philosophers, H. P. Blavatsky observes, "had to be *initiated into perceptive mysteries,* before they could grasp the correct idea" with respect to the subject of Deity. "Otherwise—outside such initiation—for every thinker there will be a 'Thus far shalt thou go and no farther,' mapped out by his intellectual capacity, as clearly and as unmistakeably as there is for the progress of any nation or race in its cycle by the law of Karma." (I, 326.)

The parallel between intellectual capacity and national karma may be interpreted as more than a mere figure of speech. Beyond intellectual knowledge is spiritual knowledge, but this is ever a knowledge of the twin laws of brotherhood and karma. The progress of the individual depends upon his racial and national karma, as well as on his personal destiny, and what takes one Ego beyond the limits of his nation or race, so far as spiritual knowledge goes, is not different from that which separates him "out" of the general karma. He comes out and is separate, to the degree that he places himself under more stringent rules of action; knowledge of karma, even in its first beginnings, brings to bear upon the student a stronger discipline. Yet, escaping from the general influences of nation and race,

he does not escape responsibility. Rather, he discovers how much greater his responsibility is, and therefore, how he must enlarge his idea of brotherhood.

As his knowledge of brotherhood and karma builds, he finds himself seeking further within the "actual objective records" of his teacher's works, striving to comprehend the nature of the "intelligent and fully self-conscious men" who preserve the doctrines, and beginning to rely upon the "imperishable center" where the great ideas are impacted. Training the mind to allow passage of metaphysical ideas or abstractions, the student opens the way for the more subtle perceptions by means of which he apprehends the Teacher standing behind the recorded words, and other Teachers still beyond. Then, indeed, the world his intellect enveloped shrinks into insignificance; his inner eye is fixed on other constellations, and searches other skies. He would no longer say, "knowledge exists as an abstraction," but simply, *knowledge exists,* for the plane on which knowledge is no longer an abstraction has begun to be part of his self-conscious experience.

KNOWLEDGE AS A SOUL-POWER

The term "knowledge" as used here has a greater meaning than we are accustomed to giving it. It implies full identification of the mind, for any length of time, with whatever object or subject it is directed to. Modern science and metaphysics do not admit that the mind can cognize outside of certain given methods and distances, and in most quarters the existence of soul is denied or ignored. It is held, for instance, that one cannot know the constituents and properties of a piece of stone without mechanical or chemical aids applied directly to the object; and that nothing can be known of the thoughts or feelings of another person unless they are expressed in words or acts. Where metaphysicians deal with soul they are vague and appear to be afraid of science, because it is not possible to analyze it and weigh its parts in a balance. Soul and Mind are reduced to the condition of limited instruments which take note of certain physical facts spread before them through mechanical aids. In the things of the spirit and of the mind, the modern schools seem, to the sincere student of this Philosophy, to be woefully ignorant. —WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

REINCARNATION OF ANIMALS

VERY little has been said on the question whether or not the theory of Reincarnation applies to animals in the same way as to man. Doubtless if Brahman members well acquainted with Sanscrit works on the general subject were to publish their views, we should at least have a large mass of material for thought and find many clues to the matter in the Hindu theories and allegories. Even Hindu folk-lore would suggest much. Under all popular "superstitions" a large element of truth can be found hidden away when the vulgar notion is examined in the light of the Wisdom-Religion. A good instance of this on the material plane is to be found in the new treatment proposed for small-pox. The old superstition was that all patients with that disease must be treated and kept in darkness. But the practice was given up by modern doctors. Recently, however, some one had the usual "flash" and decided that perhaps the chemical rays of the sun had something to do with the matter, and began to try red glass for all windows where small-pox patients were. Success was reported, the theory being that the disease was one where the chemical rays injured the skin and health just as they do in ordinary sunburn. Here we see, if the new plan be found right, that an old superstition was based on a law of nature. In the same way the folk-lore of such an ancient people as the Hindu deserves scrutiny with the object of discovering the buried truth. If they are possessed of such notions regarding the fate of animals, careful analysis might give valuable suggestion.

Looking at the question in the light of Theosophical theories, we see that a wide distinction exists between man and animals. Man reincarnates as man because he has got to the top of the present scale of evolution. He cannot go back, for Manas is too much developed. He has a *Devachan* because he is a conscious thinker. Animals cannot have *Manas* so much developed, and so cannot be self-conscious in the sense that man is. Besides all this, the animal kingdom, being lower, has the impulse still to rise to higher forms. But here we have the distinct statement by the Adepts through

---

NOTE.—This article by Mr. Judge was first printed in *The Path,* April, 1894.

H.P.B. that while possibly animals may rise higher in their own kingdom, they cannot in this evolution rise to the human stage, as we have reached the middle or turning-point in the fourth round. On this point H.P.B. has, in the second volume of the *Secret Doctrine* at page 196, a footnote as follows:

> In calling the animal "soulless" it is not depriving the beast, from the humblest to the highest species, of a "soul," but only of a conscious surviving Ego-soul, i.e., that principle which survives after a man and reincarnates in a like man.
>
> The animal has an astral body that survives the physical form for a short period; but its (animal) Monad does not reincarnate in the same, but in a higher species, and has no "Devachan" of course. It has the *seeds* of all the human principles in itself; but they are latent.

Here the distinction above adverted to is made. It is due to the Ego-Soul, that is, to *Manas* with *Buddhi* and *Atma.* Those principles being latent in the animal, and the door to the human kingdom being closed, they may rise to higher species but not to the man stage. Of course also it is not meant that no dog or other animal ever reincarnates as dog, but that the monad has tendency to rise to a higher species, whatever that be, whenever it has passed beyond the necessity for further experience as "dog." Under the position the author assumes, it would be natural to suppose that the astral form of the animal did not last long, as she says, and hence that astral appearances or apparitions of animals were not common. Such is the fact. I have heard of a few, but very few, cases where a favorite animal made an apparitional appearance after death, but even the prolific field of spiritualism has not many instances of the kind. And those who have learned about the astral world know that human beings assume in that world the form of animal or other things which they in character most resemble, and that this sort of apparition is not confined to the dead but is more common among the living. It is by such signs that clairvoyants know the very life and thought of the person before them. It was under the operation of this law that Swedenborg saw so many curious things in his time.

The objection based on the immense number of animals both alive and dead as calling for a supply of monads in that stage can

be met in this way. While it is stated that no more animal monads can enter on the man-stage, it is not said nor inferred that the incoming supply of monads for the animal kingdom has stopped. They may still be coming in from other worlds for evolution among the animals of this globe. There is nothing impossible in it, and it will supply the answer to the question, Where do the new animal monads come from, supposing that all the present ones have exhausted the whole number of higher species possible here? It is quite possible also that the animal monads may be carried on to other members of the earth-chain in advance of man for the purpose of necessary development, and this would lessen the number of their appearances here. For what keeps man here so long is that the power of his thought is so great as to make a *Devachan* for all lasting some fifteen centuries—with exceptions—and for a number who desire "heaven" a *Devachan* of enormous length. The animals, however, being devoid of developed *Manas,* have no *Devachan* and must be forced onwards to the next planet in the chain. This would be consistent and useful, as it gives them a chance for development in readiness for the time when the monads of that kingdom shall begin to rise to a new human kingdom. They will have lost nothing, but, on the contrary, will be the gainers. WILLIAM BREHON

SELF-KNOWLEDGE

The first necessity for obtaining self-knowledge is to become profoundly conscious of ignorance; to feel with every fibre of the heart that one is *ceaselessly* self-deceived.

The second requisite is the still deeper conviction that such knowledge—such intuitive and certain knowledge—can be obtained by effort.

The third and most important is an indomitable determination to obtain and face that knowledge.

Self-knowledge of this kind is unattainable by what men usually call "self-analysis." It is not reached by reasoning or any brain process; for it is the awakening to consciousness of the Divine nature of man.

To obtain this knowledge is a greater achievement than to command the elements or to know the future.

—*Lucifer,* October, 1887

FREE-WILL AND NECESSITY

ARE our wills free or are they bound upon the wheel of rigid necessity? If the whole of nature is subject to the sway of determinism (variously termed causal law,* necessity and karma) how can we attribute spontaneity to the "willing" faculty? In what sense is man "the maker and fashioner of his destiny," as interpreters of Theosophy have declared him to be?

To the theosophist who excludes the word "chance" from his vocabulary, when explaining any physical phenomenon, action, or human attitude, an *uncaused* "will" is unthinkable. That would mean the rule of anarchy rather than that of law. That every beginning must have a cause is a philosophical aphorism as old as the hills. Hence a *determined* "will" is surely a *lawful* "will."

Every analyst of historical data tacitly assumes the operation of determinism. In order to understand the complex of circumstances, which renders clashes between nations or classes inevitable, he laboriously reconstructs the background in which the historic causes of these conflicts are rooted. The practice of the criminologist to seek a *motive* for the crime he would unravel implies a belief in determinism. Likewise the theosophist indicates his acceptance of determinism when he affirms that a man's ability to mount the rungs of the evolutionary ladder, by "self-induced and self-devised efforts," is necessarily limited by his karma. Indirectly he is acknowledging, is he not, that any specific action is conditioned by the vast interplay† of events which preceded it? Indeed, might we not be justified in asserting that the whole universe is the result of the first Cause?

---

*Although causal law is definable in more than one way, the law itself can never be impugned. The logician of the traditional school was convinced that the effect was contained in the cause in the same manner that the conclusion of the syllogism is implied in the initial premise. The belief in such a necessary relation was effectively challenged by Hume. Since then, many thinkers have equated causality with the principle of succession. This emphasis on regularity of sequence permits us to regard a uniformity like day and night as a causal relation. But basically the causal law affirms the connection and interdependence of all things.

†Some people who attempt to understand causal law visualize an interminable chain reaching forward and backward into the mists of time. But this is an inadequate image if we keep in mind the interconnection of all things, and the fact that causes are multiplied on the plane of empirical reality as well as on the psychological level.

Because the principle of determinism has long been associated (if not identified) with the materialistic philosophy of mechanism, we are sometimes apt to disregard the prominent place accorded it in the philosophy of Theosophy. Since Theosophy is a spiritual system of thought, its doctrine of cosmic necessity does not coincide exactly with the mechanistic view. What precisely is the difference between the two?

To state the mechanist view first: All cause is reducible to mechanical force which operates in a universe indifferent to man's moral thirst for righteousness, and his soaring flights of the imagination, because the universe is purposeless. Having arbitrarily banished design, the mechanist confines his attention to what Aristotle called "efficient" causes. He is not interested in final causes because his function is to describe rather than explain. In other words, he is interested in external factors like soil, rain and sun which make a poppy seed grow into a poppy. That latent "something" (or astral model, as theosophists would say), whereby a poppy seed becomes a poppy and not a rose, is tactfully ignored. The application of mechanism to biology has resulted in Darwinian evolution, long outmoded in Europe because it could never explain satisfactorily the startling implications of instinctual conduct, protective colouration and the physical effects of mental excitation. Mechanism applied to the psychological level, leading to the concept of mind as a complex of inorganic matter, has also been found inadequate and effectively challenged by the vitalists. Although behaviorists abound, it is still a mystery how physical and chemical reactions produce awareness and psychical sensitivity.

Theosophy, it is true, has certain points of agreement with mechanism. H.P.B., in her article "Psychic and Noëtic Action" (THEOSOPHY XXVIII, 206 and 254), states that material laws have their ground in necessity, for all visible phenomena, as occultism avers, have their source in motion. But she is at pains to stress the point that self-consciousness as well as free-will proceeds from the Self, which exists on a plane superior to karmic law. Moreover, like the vitalists, she maintains that the whole is greater than its parts. For example, how can water be the exact equivalent of two parts of hydrogen and one part of oxygen if hydrogen is an explosive gas and oxygen a combustible one, while an important

property of water is its power to quench fire? On the basis of this, Theosophy would naturally deny that the mind is merely a congeries of psychical states.

Although deterministic, as far as the phenomenal world goes, and therefore conceding much to mechanism, Theosophy, like ancient Stoicism* presents a spiritual world-view. The universe is the emanation of divine Mind, and determinism holds sway within a framework of purposive design, according to the Theosophical teaching. In other words, there is a force that guides events other than, and beyond, physical and chemical reactions. While we are *conditioned,* true enough, by our past karma, there is the magnetic pull exercised by the Indwelling Lord, in our waking or dreaming states, whose nature is of the essence of righteousness. Thus overshadowing our relative existence, this omnipresent, unchanging Principle of Love acts upon us as an inner compulsion to struggle toward the expression of goodness, mercy and kindness. And this Lord, in a manner incomprehensible to our human faculties, as we ascend in consciousness to the archetypal realm of pure ideas, has power to change our lives, to *greatly modify* the impending doom of past karmas.

Thus is man's will subject to a dual conditioning—material and spiritual.

Perhaps it is because man's mind is itself a dichotomy, corresponding to Theosophy's second Fundamental,† that his will is doubly determined and for this reason also we can paradoxically affirm his freedom and non-freedom at one and the same time. In the philosophy of Theosophy, as has been intimated, we are presented

---

*The Stoic philosophy, which had important affinities with Oriental thought, embraced the doctrine of cosmic necessity. Sovereign reason, benevolent in its ultimate purpose, was believed to govern the world process. Everything that happened could not have happened otherwise. But all this was considered to be according to natural *law,* which is to be distinguished from arbitrary fate. So all men were deemed in harmony with nature, voluntarily or unvoluntarily. The "Hymn of Cleanthes" (translated from the Greek by Edwin Bevan in *Stoics and Sceptics*) is a paean to the great rational Spirit that begot the world—

"But Thou knowest how to make odd things even,
And to order what is disorderly, and unlovely things are lovely to Thee.
For in such wise hast Thou fitted all things together in one, good with evil,
That there results a reasonable design (logos) of the whole, enduring forever."

†Many scientists are now impressed with the fact that the universe seems pervaded by duality. For instance, most scientists have mentally adapted themselves to the fact that the "corpuscular" and "wave" theories of light are equally tenable.

with arguments and statements which support both the theories of freewill and determinism.

The idea of the universe, as the gigantic product of necessity, was repeatedly emphasized by H.P.B. in many passages in the *Secret Doctrine* and other of her writings. She declared that gods, angels and men were subservient to immutable karmic law. On the imperishable records of the astral light or traced in the eternal hieroglyphs of the stars,* H.P.B. informs us, are inscribed the destined course of events. Not a jot can be added to, nor a tittle taken from, the indelible markings of the akashic scroll that time unrolls. Her statement that "the future, like the *past,* is ever alive in the *present,*" is an admission of determinism—the strictly causal connection that binds all things together. Her reference to the colloquy in the *Puranas* between the sage Vasishta and his impetuous grandson Parasara furnishes corroborative material from an ancient scripture of the inevitability of karma or the law of cause and effect. The young man was bent on destroying the race of the Rakshasa because they had murdered his father. But seemingly the venerable counselor was as deeply devoted to the causal principle as any Stoic, or any modern physicist, for the matter of that, before the irrational behaviour of electrons was observed. To his grandson he remarked: "The Rakshasas are not culpable; thy father's death *was the work of Karma.* Anger is the passion of fools; it becometh not a wise man. . . ." (*S.D.* I, 415.)

In what sense is the will "free," beyond the reach of karma, as H.P.B. claimed in "Psychic and Noëtic Action," refusing, unlike the current physiologists, to relegate everything to the category of necessity? If we define "will" as the *power* (rooted in the Self) *to effect change,* then it would appear that the "willing" activity, separated from the motivation of desire, is as immaterial a thing as pure consciousness without the modifications of thought. But though this *power* of will is superior to psychical states, and minus, as H.P.B. points out, any material organ to register its activity, nevertheless the "will" *derives its colour and direction from desire.* So said Patanjali. His classic definition of will as a colourless force is well

*In the opinion of H.P.B., and in the words of "one of the modern adepts of Astrology," the solar system can influence the *tabula rasa* of an infant's brain, "according to the presence on the zenith of such or another zodiacal constellation." (*S.D.* I, 105.)

known. Our many desires are the upsurge of subconscious impressions. For in the deeper levels of being, we may imagine, lies imbedded the karmic fruitage of our past incarnations. Our analytical reason, which is as much a part of us as sensation, compels us to regard "will" as determined, in large measure, by desire which arises out of our "subconscious."

From the standpoint of ignorance—ignorance that we are identical with the Krishna who staged the great mayavic drama, we are just marionettes. But from the point of view of our spiritual identity, we ourselves have staged the show. It is ours. All of us together have created the world kaleidoscope—the mighty spectacle of becoming —and must struggle through together, in fair or foul weather. The rhythmic turning of the wheel of destiny has ordained that some of us shall bear the burden of the world's negativity, while others shall dispense the Light. But none of us shall all the time be promoters of evil and woe. The law of change, the tendency of the deterministic universe to restore balance, forbids it. Since the mills of the Gods grind *slowly,* many incarnations are required to subserve the purposes of the all-dominating goddess Nemesis.

The real crux of the freedom-necessity problem, as far as the theosophist is concerned, would appear to be this: If our wills are determined, does this relieve us of responsibility? The hereditist would answer in the affirmative, but the theosophist would say—no. As the *conscious* agents and executors of destiny, we must play out our hand to the end, reaping what we have sown. H.P.B. in the *Secret Doctrine* refers to Prometheus as a "conscious, hence a responsible entity." Since we are independent Spiritual beings working out our nisus to the whole for self-completion, there is, strictly speaking, no "bad karma." Only a variety of experiences can hasten that condition of ripeness that makes the divine realization, and escape from determinism, inevitable.

Before closing, a brief reference might be made to the tendency, somewhat unwarranted on the basis of the facts, among certain philosopher-physicists, to reject causation because of the unpredictability of the electron's motion as it flies from one orbit to another. Although science may someday discover a theory that will unify present discrepancies, the theosophist, in orienting himself to this major "crisis" in physics may justly observe: Nature will always

present an irrational and a rational face to the enquiring intelligence of man, because man's mind is dual like the universe, and the existence of an overshadowing Absolute decrees that there shall always be, somewhere, at every moment of time, a ring-pass-not.

Finally, to sum up, we are forced to the paradoxical conclusion that "will" is both free and not free. Propelled this way or that by desire, "will" is subject to causal law. But man's immediate irresponsible sense of freedom, in the exercise of choice, is a reflection on the mirror of the mind of the occult truth that "will" as *power* is rooted in That which is beyond time, space and causality. Moreover, man is *self*-determined, for the universe is the projection of his own consciousness.

"Discernment and Criticism"

It is true that in discussing measures and principles names have sometimes to be mentioned; but this can always be done in a spirit of kindness and consideration that arouses no ill feeling, that puts no one to open shame. He who is found active in a good cause; who stipulates nothing and demands nothing, but works wherever he can find a foothold; who takes pains to commend and approve, but who never condemns or criticises others; such an one has learned the true spirit of discernment and the wisest discrimination, and is a power such as few persons conceive of.

Many make the mistake of supposing that if they do not make haste to criticise and condemn, and even openly to repudiate the acts or words of others, they will themselves be held responsible for the same opinions. These forget that probably the first effect of their hostile criticism will be to confirm their opponent in his error, admitting it to be an error; whereas, if one is sure of his ground and shows the opposite view without reference to persons, these views, being passionless and exciting no opposition, will hold by their own force and inherent truthfulness. The opponent is disarmed and convinced, not by an opponent, but by truth itself. He who really cares more for the truth than for his own opinion, right or wrong; who cares more for the triumph of truth than for his own triumph over an antagonist, and perhaps a weak one at that, will not hesitate a moment which course to choose.

—J. D. Buck in *The Path,* January, 1891

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK—

WHY *is so much made of the statement that the Absolute is not the First Cause but the* Causeless *Cause? There does not seem to be such an important distinction between the two concepts.*

As is understandable in regard to anything having to do with the Absolute, *immediate* relevance is difficult to see—we cannot quite trace the line from such an Abstraction to the concrete realities of our daily lives. But is not its very abstractness a protection against any attempt to make of the Absolute a kind of personal God? When we say it is the "Causeless Cause," we are not only saying that it is the ultimate Cause,—or, perhaps more correctly, that the Absolute is not a "cause" at all,—underlying and preceding all other causes, but we are also implying that it is *out of relation to all other causes.* What does this mean? Simply, we think, that we must discard the idea—the very persistent idea—that the Absolute has anything to do with the world of manifestation. There are a number of corollaries to this idea, but one of the most direct, perhaps, is the implication that man himself, and none other, is the responsible agent on this plane of action and in this sphere of being. The Absolute has equally nothing to do with the origin of Evil, or with the origin of Good. Says Krishna in the Gita, "I established this universe with a portion of myself and remain separate," and H. P. Blavatsky speaks in the *Key to Theosophy* of "the only universal and eternal *reality* casting a periodical reflection of itself on the infinite Spatial depths."

There is, therefore, no God on whom we can lay the responsibility for the evil—or the good—that befalls us. The direct cause of man's mishaps is man himself, and the Absolute—as the *Causeless* Cause—stands in no causal relation to any effects. But after a certain point, an attempt at clarification of such tenuous conceptions merely makes for more mental confusion. We can take heart from H.P.B.'s statement in the *S.D.* (I, 44-5), "According to esoteric teaching, the real cause . . . of all existence, remains for ever hidden, and its first emanations are the most complete abstractions the mind can conceive." Every abstraction is a challenge to the mind, which

immediately wants to make it in some degree a concretion. Beyond this challenge, and set against it, is the greater challenge—the challenge to develop that philosophical perception which transcends the mind, and which is strong enough to let an abstraction remain an abstraction on its proper plane of immateriality.

It is often said that when we find fault with another, it means that the very faults we attack exist in ourselves. This hardly seems justifiable, unless we are to accuse everyone of conscious or unconscious hypocrisy. Admitted that none of us are sufficiently "without sin" to cast the first stone, but surely the fact that we can see another's shortcomings doesn't necessarily mean that we share in them?

The statement quoted *does* hardly seem justifiable, as the questioner suggests. But does it not stir to life some interesting considerations on this matter of fault-finding? While we may not agree that to see a fault in another indicates the existence of the same fault in ourselves, still, have we not sometimes caught ourselves ranting against someone else for doing something we ourselves have done—or would like to do?

There is ample basis in the philosophy of Theosophy for the assumption that if the criticized faults do not already exist in the character of the fault-finder, they will eventually present themselves. Mr. Judge found many occasions, in his *Letters,* for pointing out that hate, as well as love, is an attractive power, and inevitably draws the one who feels it into the toils of the thing despised. "To turn away in horror is *not* detachment," he once wrote, and in his series of articles entitled "Conversations on Occultism," he speaks most definitely of what occurs: "Every time you harshly and unmercifully criticise the faults of another, you produce an attraction to yourself of certain quantities of elementals from that person. They fasten themselves upon you and endeavor to find in you a similar state or spot or fault [to] that they have left in the other person. It is as if they left him to serve you at higher wages, so to say." (THEOSOPHY, February, 1949, p. 177.) Here we are afforded a logical and persuasive reason for not dwelling on the faults of others. The doctrine of the elementals, as expounded by Mr. Judge in the series mentioned, completes the injunction of Jesus, "Let him

who is without sin cast the first stone," by showing that he who casts the stone of vituperation and contempt marks himself as its future victim.

Why is it that we resent the circumstances we are in, if indeed we ourselves created them? So many of the things that happen to us do *seem "uncaused" events.*

Isn't it mainly because we don't know that we created them? This is what makes reincarnation an absolute necessity as a corollary to the doctrine of karma—else how could we find justice in the circumstances in which we are born, and with which, naturally, on a one-life basis, we could have had no previous connection? But leaving aside those cases where we suffer for the sins—or mistakes—of a past personality which was our instrument, we can perhaps see that in the daily round of causation, we are often equally unaware that we are bringing about uncomfortable circumstances for ourselves.

How can this be? we ask. Are we not rational, intelligent human beings, able to trace cause to effect, and effect back to cause? Well, we are *able* to, and mostly succeed, but when emotions are overly-involved, the trail connecting cause and effect is apt to become crossed, re-crossed and confused. Do we remember that the results of an action flow not only from the act itself, but also from its motivation—that is, we feel the effects of our inner attitude as well as of our outward act? So, if we are attempting to discover what the effects of any act will be, we need to clearly and honestly assess our underlying motivations. Unless we can do this—and it is far from easy—we cannot expect to anticipate all the ramifying results of our acts. We may wonder, for example, "Why should this person react with anger to my perfectly harmless suggestion?"—being unaware of the self-righteousness that underlay our tone and roused resentment in the listener.

Then, again, consider how many of our acts are dictated by our emotions—and how often do we stop to think what the result of an act will be, so long as the doing of it brings us pleasure at the moment? Too much of the time we don't bother to consider more than the immediate result, in terms of sensation; then how can we possibly say that the circumstances we are in are "uncaused events"?

H.P.B. ON KABBALISTIC INTERPRETATION

[Exactly a century ago, H. P. Blavatsky, then twenty years of age, met in London the adept she called her Master, and across the Channel, in Ireland, there came to birth, in that same year, William Q. Judge, who was to be her "only friend." Little is known about H.P.B.'s life, however, until 1875, when the theosophical movement of the nineteenth century was begun in New York City. In general, it is understood that H.P.B.'s travels during the mid-century years brought her under the tuition of various initiates at ancient centers of philosophy and religion in Europe, Asia, and the Americas. Otherwise, the period remains indistinct, H.P.B. herself writing to a would-be biographer, "Between H. P. Blavatsky in 1875 and H.P.B. from 1830 to that date, is a veil drawn and you are in no way concerned with what took place behind it, before I appeared as a public character. It was my PRIVATE LIFE holy and sacred. . . ."

All the more significant, then, are the brief allusions, here and there in H.P.B.'s writings, to personages and events belonging to those early years. A few of these preface a scholarly contribution from H.P.B. on the "Tetragrammaton," published in the *Theosophist* of November, 1887, the same month in which "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels" began in her magazine *Lucifer.* Opening the discussion of the four-lettered symbol-name for Jehovah, H.P.B. remarked that she had studied the Kabbala "for nearer forty than thirty years." Nevertheless, she declares, "I will give nothing of my own speculations or knowledge, which are my personal property, the fruitage of my studies, and with which, therefore, the public has nothing to do. I shall only show what the Tetragrammaton is said to be in the *Zohar,* and as explained to the writer personally by a Hebrew initiated Rabbi, in Palestine, and made very plain to every advanced Kabbalist." Then, with material later given in her *Secret Doctrine* (see "Tetragrammaton"), H.P.B. entered another unequivocal protest against that most distasteful of all dogmas, the personal-god-idea. The Conclusion of her article, reprinted below, illustrates the lengths to which undisciplined or partisan theorizing can go. It is clear that comparative study of religions is bound to be confusing and unsatisfactory, unless the student has clear conceptions of first principles and universal teachings.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.]

WHATEVER the transcendental, metaphysical speculations and interpretations, which, of course, can be satisfied with *Tetraktis* on the plane of the Archetypal world, once that we descend into the world of the Astral and of the phenomenally occult, we cannot have less than seven principles upon which to base ourselves. I have studied the Kabbala under two learned Rabbis, one of whom was an initiate, and there was no difference between the two teachings (the esoteric Eastern and the Western) in this instance.

Of course it is well known that any one endowed with even a moderate dose of ingenuity can, if he has studied the three Kabbalistic modes of interpretation—especially the *Notarikon*—make what he likes of the unpointed Hebrew words and letters. But the explanations I give require no Notarikon, but simply a knowledge of the seventh esoteric key. With Massoretic points one can transform the astral Jehovah Tzaboath, and even Jehovah-Elohim, into the "One living" and the highest God, the "God of gods"—whereas he is merely one of the formative and *generative* gods. A good instance of the above dishonesty is found in Mr. Mathers' translation of Knorr von Rosenroth's *Kabbalah Denudata.* He gives us six specimens of the various readings of the first word only (B'rashith) in *Genesis.* With the rules of *Notarikon* the opening sentence *"B'rashith Bara Elohimeth hashamayim v'eth h'arts,"* or "In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth," may be made to mean whatever one pleases; since the first and solitary word *B'rashith* is forced to yield six dogmatic teachings of the Latin Church.

As shown by the aforesaid Kabbalist, Solomon Meir Ben Moses, a convert to Roman Catholicism in 1665, who took the name of Prosper Rugere, succeeded in proving on strictly *Notariconist* grounds that the said first word (B'rashith) revealed six Christian meanings, the first of these was "The sun, the spirit, the father, their trinity, perfect unity"; the third, "Ye shall worship my first-born, my first, whose name is Jesus"; the fifth, "I will choose a Virgin worthy to bring forth Jesus, and ye shall call her blessed." The sixth is given in the footnote below.* The two others are repetitions.

---

*In the *Notarikon,* "Every letter of a word is taken for the initial or abbreviation of another word, so that from the letters of a word a sentence may be formed." Thus, from the letters of this word *B'rashith,* I too could easily make a sentence which

The same remarkable elasticity of interpretation is afforded in the esoteric texts of other nations. Each symbol and glyph having *seven keys* to it, it follows that one party may be using one key to any subject under dispute, and then accuse another student who is using another key of deliberate misinterpretation.

Such is not *my* policy however. In esoteric matters I would rather seek conciliation than quarrel over mistakes made, whether real or imaginary; because the CAUSE and the triumph of truth ought to be dearer to a true Occultist and Theosophist than petty successes over disputants.

No one occultist, if he is true to his colors, can give out the meaning of *all* the "Seven Mysteries of Wisdom"—even if he himself is acquainted with *all*—which would be a marvel, indeed. For those "Seven Mysteries" *in toto* are known thoroughly only to the "MASTERS OF WISDOM"; and those Masters would hardly indulge in polemical discussions, whether in newspaper or periodical. What is the use then of losing time and power over proving that one facet of the diamond shines with more light and brilliancy than its sister facet instead of uniting all the forces to draw the attention of the profane to the radiance of the jewel itself? We students of the sacred science ought to help each other, encourage research and profit by our mutual knowledge, instead of unprofitably criticizing it to satisfy personal pride. This is how I look at it: for otherwise our enemies, who started by calling us humbugs on the sole strength of their sectarian and materialistic prejudices and bigotry, will be justified in reiterating their accusation on the ground of our mutual denunciations.

Materialism is raising its ghastly head higher than ever.

Knowledge, one of the scientific papers of London, gives us a foretaste of what is in store for the occultist. While reviewing the *Kabbalah Unveiled,* it is loud in proclaiming "the extraordinary intellectual vagaries of the Hebrew commentators on their scrip-

---

would read:—*"Beware! rows are soon hatched in Theosophy";* and then offer it as a divine warning and revelation, taking as my authority the "Book of God." This reading would be as true, but more to the point than the 6th of Prosper Rugere's versions; for he made of *B'rashith*—*"Beauogh ratzephim Asattar Shegopi Jeshuah Thakelo,"* which, translated, reads "I (God) will hide myself in cake (wafer) for ye shall eat Jesus, my body"—and converted thereby, and forthwith, another Jew to Roman Catholicism!

tures." It crushes under the weight of its materialist contempt the idea from Dr. Ginsburg's "Essay on the Kabbalah"—that the mysteries of being were "taught by the Almighty himself to a select company of angels, who formed a theosophic school in Paradise!" and winds up by a tremendous point of mocking admiration, in parenthesis (!). This, on page 259 of *Knowledge,* Sept, 1, 1887. On page 245, Mr. Edward Clodd offers us, instead of the teachings of the "Theosophic angels," those of the Darwinists of the Haeckelian School. Having surveyed "a vast field" in Kosmos, "the limits of which shade into the unlimited on all sides," this anti-Kabbalistic champion of modern science ends his *"vagaries"* by the following startling enunciation:

> "We began with the primitive nebula, we end with the highest forms of consciousness; *the story of creation is shown* (!?) to be the unbroken record of the evolution OF GAS INTO GENIUS" (!!!).

This shows how we stand with the men of *modern* science and how much we need all our forces to hold the materialists at bay.

One word more and I have done. I am repeatedly asked to show my authority—book, page and verse—for the esoteric doctrine of the "Septenary." This is like saying to one in the midst of a desert, prove to me that water is full of *infusoria,* when there is no microscope to be got. Better than any one, those who make such a claim upon me, know that outside of the few places where secret *MSS.* are stored for ages, no *esoteric* doctrines *were ever written and plainly explained;* otherwise they would have lost long ago their very name. There is such a thing as an "unwritten" Kabbala, as well as a written one, even in the West. Many things are *orally* explained, and always have been. Nevertheless, hints and allusions to it are numerous and scattered throughout the exoteric scriptures, and the classification depends, of course, on the school that interprets it, and still more upon personal intuition and conception. The question is not whether there are three, five or seven colours in the rays of the *spectrum,* for every one knows there is, in fact and nature, but one—the colourless white. And, though Science discerns very plainly seven prismatic rays as clear as are the seven notes in the scale; yet, one has heard of very great men of science who insisted there were only four or five until it was found out that they were colour-blind.

H. P. BLAVATSKY

"THE GITA"—INFORMAL ESSAYS

On Everyday Problems

"Unto thee who findeth no fault, I will now make known. . . ."

IN commenting upon the opening sentences of Chapter Nine, Robert Crosbie, in *Notes on the Gita,* calls attention to the fact that the essential element of querulousness and complaint in man stems from a lack of faith in Universal Law. This certainly suggests one of the many reasons why H. P. Blavatsky writes that the ethics implicit in the doctrines of karma and reincarnation "can save the coming races." Faith in law means two things: A willingness to accept responsibility for all of one's thoughts and deeds; and, secondly, faith in oneself as a being who may ultimately correct all the errors that lead to grief. Such a faith is incompatible with "querulousness."

Yet there is another important question which remains to be explored by the inquiring student. Like all psychological questions, it has no definite answer, but is rather a point of departure for that constructive form of introspection which prompts us to have less patience with ourselves and a great deal more patience with those around us. The question is, simply, *Why* do men have so little "faith in law," since the doctrines of karma and reincarnation have been available in all ages, and would have been universally accepted if sufficient willingness to establish that faith were present? How are we to account for those many religious *disclaimers* of just and equal moral law, who have exerted great influence? The answer to this question, as to many others, may be found to be involved with what H. P. Blavatsky calls the great "force of inertia" operative in average human nature. When we are faced with a situation we do not approve of, it is easier to criticize than to attempt to comprehend. For, in this seductive process, no changes are required within, our contention actually being that the *situation* "should" change.

Of all the forms of fault-finding most tragically associated with the difficult story of the larger Theosophical Movement, that of objecting to a teacher's method of instruction is the most notorious. We might imagine that Jesus of Nazareth—our best known symbol for the crucifixion of a Great Teacher—would not actually have been opposed so much on matters of *doctrine* as he was resented on

matters of *method,* by those who betrayed him. In the history of religious orthodoxy, doctrines become a violent battleground only when identified with a method that challenges current practices.

Passing from the symbolic meaning of the crucifixion of Christ to the early days of H. P. Blavatsky's teaching of theosophic philosophy, it may be observed that disruptions in the Theosophical Society inevitably followed Hume's, Sinnett's and Olcott's dissatisfaction with the *way* in which they were instructed. "This is not the way one should ideally be taught. If you will teach me this which I want to know *first,* thus granting me wisdom to dictate my own terms of initiation, all will be well." This paraphrasing of communications addressed by Mr. Hume to his Eastern correspondent gives the tone of many attitudes confronting H. P. Blavatsky. Col. Olcott, incidentally, was thoroughly convinced that H. P. Blavatsky should teach through the impressiveness of "miracle," and was critical of her supposed mismanagement of the opportunities to attract a large following on that basis. Later, many were those who turned uninterestedly away from working association with William Q. Judge, because the latter was unspectacular, or a bit non-intellectual in his approach to the problem of disseminating Theosophical ideas. Horror of horrors, among some, he was not even very literary! And to those who enjoyed the warming privilege of working association with Robert Crosbie during the days of the foundation of U.L.T., it must have been apparent that many failed to give whole-hearted allegiance when they discovered that other "teachers" of Theosophy were more emotionally impressive than he was in lecturing ability.

If we turn from these briefly highlighted historical reminders to an examination of problems among fellow theosophical workers of the present, we may do well to conclude that precisely the same temptation to error exists on every hand. Working students are presumably fitting themselves to learn from every moment of their mutual contact with one another, all being teachers and pupils in a fraternity of allegiance to identical philosophical principles. Yet it is most difficult, is it not, to accept an idea, even when offered with conviction, from someone with whom we do not currently feel in rapport? Our emotional preferences for the company of this or that personality fluctuate continuously. Still, there is no necessity, even

if this latter condition be regarded as inevitable, for the same fluctuation to obtain in regard to our presumed devotion to truth itself.

Many interpretations of the "heart doctrine" have been given, and undoubtedly will continue to be given. One of the many misinterpretations is that an adequate teacher must be able to make all those with whom he or she is associated "feel" a certain way—that is, receptive and helpful. Yet it is not the task of the teacher to make anyone "feel" any way at all, but only to do the best that may be done, with limitations of personality and environment, to "make clean and clear mental perceptions and conceptions." The ideal student and the ideal teacher need much of the heart doctrine, but the heart doctrine first manifests in this equation as a depth of constructive sincerity, so great that the tides of personality are never allowed to inhibit the flow of beneficial influence. And "teachers" need a faith in patience, far more than they need faith in a personal capacity to evoke or feel all-embracing love. This, not because all-embracing love is less than the most important quality of all, but because it cannot be sought as an end in itself, being instead an efflorescence of hard work well done. We cannot conjure up love, nor can we invent situations of emotional rapport between audience and speaker, between writer and reader. But we can look for the constructive truth in anything said to us by a fellow man, whether or not we like his preferences, idiosyncrasies, wife, children or business associates, his methods of dealing with any of these—or his preferred ways for stating ideas.

To sum up the developments of this particular line of thought, then, it may be permissible to attempt establishment of an equation: Fault-finding, of whatever sort, lessens both the opportunities and benefits of the universal educative process which is man's chief work in life. There is nothing from which we may not be "instructed," nor any human agency who cannot, in some significant way, enlighten or enliven our understanding. Fault-finding, in the sense of criticism, seems to have its place in every relationship. Yet unless its place is a subservient one, the force of inertia will triumph once again over those subtle efforts of creative will which represent man's spiritual aspiration to learn. We might say that the most logical safeguard against a compounding of all of the typical errors mentioned would be a determination to do away with fault-finding

entirely and replace it, when it needs to be replaced by something, with open disagreement. Disagreement, whether gentle or violent, is always more constructive than the passing-judgment habit.

In each personal situation, every family or individual relationship, there may be a time for the individuals involved to compare notes on the present behavior of their respective psyches. But this is a project *within* a personal relationship, which, to be successful, must be carried on with complete openness and with what is currently called "objectivity." It is, moreover, "disagreement" rather than fault-finding. Relationships *within Theosophical work,* however, if they infrequently provide sufficient intimacy for successful devotion to such a proposal, do not need personal criticism. What is needed, instead, is the spirit of the resourceful architect, whose one passion is to create a habitable and substantial dwelling, all of whose ingenuity is expended in making use of whatever materials are available. Edifices fail to rise from the ground by even so much as a thousandth of an inch while the architects bemoan the lack of proper equipment or substances for building. The building will grow only when they use whatever materials they can, discarding only whatever they must. Such architects, also, are always too busy to explain, querulously, what they must discard and why.

The method of the theosophists, it would seem from the ninth chapter of the *Gita,* must be a combination of all methods, for: "Even those also who worship other gods with a firm faith in doing so, involuntarily worship me, too, . . . albeit in ignorance."

Pleasing uniformity of feeling does not, according to Krishna, provide a lasting happiness. Those, he says, who "follow the Vedas, obtain a happiness which comes and goes." These have wished for an easy harmony, rather than for Truth. Devotion to truth means a complete willingness to learn from anyone at any time, which means an end to complacency in any form—and to complacency in *some* form we are all addicted. This must be the reason why we discover that it is those who follow the Vedas who are identified by Krishna as among "those who long for the accomplishment of desires." Searching for and trying to safeguard the possession of an ideal set of "feelings" is an attribute of what, in a theosophic educational equation, is habitually called the Lower Self. Complacency and fault-finding are twins, and neither deserves to live.

COINCIDENCE

HOW often in our daily lives do we experience so-called "coincidences"! One day we might miss a train, and because of our delay we meet a friend whom we have not seen in a long time. Again, an unforeseen hour granted us by an overdue train is just time enough to consummate a delicate and crucial business transaction. It frequently happens that one travelling in far-off lands meets people who know some friends and acquaintances of his, or who even resided on his street back home. Incidents such as these, and many more, occur time and time again to every man, and, with the usual puzzled expression, he exclaims, "How strange!" Actually, nothing is strange in a universe of law, and these very occurrences are manifestations of one of the most important laws in the universe—the immutable principle of ethical causation, known to theosophists by the Sanscrit term, *Karma.*

Karma is often spoken of as the twin doctrine of Reincarnation, reincarnation being the process through which Karma can be carried out. Karma is further carried out by the relationships of individuals, and their effect upon each other's lives. We must remember, in this regard, that what we call individuals or people are *souls*—souls that have met in bodies before. During our many previous lives on this earth, we have become associated with many souls, and, whether we may like them or not, they remain attracted to us and we to them. This condition prevails to a lesser as well as greater extent in human existence. Think of the familiar faces we see as we go about our affairs—faces of people we don't even know—and still it seems that wherever we may be they are there, too. Our loved ones, of course, have been with us before and will be with us again. Yet if attractions last from incarnation to incarnation, is it not natural that myriad subtle links prevail throughout our daily lives, with respect to our acquaintances, as well as with our closest friends?

According to the teachings of Theosophy, "the word Reincarnation means that our present life is the result of previous lives, and that our future life will be in accordance with our past lives and the way we are now living. While this idea may be new to many, it is so illuminating, that with its companion doctrine Karma, it solves completely the perplexing problems of life."

Sometimes under Karma certain things are to happen to us. Often the only way such karma can come about is through so-called "chance meetings." For instance, a man due to get a certain job may learn of the opening only by running across a factory-owner whom he has not encountered in months, and who happens to need a man with his particular training. So the job is filled by one who had been wanting it—and not by chance or luck, but because that job was rightfully his, and he was brought to it under karma.

Reasons for chance meetings and coincidences are as numerous as the effects that they are destined to produce, and they take on a different aspect in each individual case, according to the individual karma involved. No one can escape karma, since it "operates on all things and beings from the minutest conceivable atom up to Brahma. Proceeding in the three worlds of men, gods, and the elemental beings, no spot in the manifested universe is exempt from its sway." Thus there is always a definite reason and purpose for everything, even though a circumstance or event may seem unimportant to us at the time. Nothing under the great law of cause and effect is either accidental or unimportant, and as we begin to understand the true nature of ourselves and the reasons for our existence, we will gradually become less puzzled by the circumstances around us. We shall realize that whatever happens to us—be it great or small—takes place so that we, as egos, may gain necessary experience.

"We stand bewildered before the mystery of our own making, and the riddles of life that *we will not* solve, and then accuse the great Sphinx of devouring us. But verily there is not an accident in our lives, not a misshapen day or a misfortune, that could not be traced back to our own doings in this or in another life."

HARMONY AND WISDOM

Harmony is the law of life, discord its shadow, whence springs suffering, the teacher, the awakener of consciousness.

The eyes of wisdom are like the ocean depths; there is neither joy nor sorrow in them; therefore the soul of the occultist must become stronger than joy, and greater than sorrow.

—*Lucifer,* September, 1887

ON THE LOOKOUT

Heresy vs. Conspiracy

Sidney Hook, chairman of the philosophy and psychology division of New York University's graduate school, has become something of an authority on the problem of the "Communist threat to liberal society." (Prof. Hook's position on the question of allowing Communists to teach in schools and colleges was reviewed in the "Lookout" for May, 1949.) In an article contributed to the New York *Times* Magazine (July 9), entitled "Heresy, Yes—But Conspiracy, No," he argues that Communism, as a *conspiracy,* can legitimately be barred from a liberal society, which, however, is bound to respect any and all *heresies.* The distinction between these two terms is valid and important:

> The failure to recognize the distinction between heresy and conspiracy is fatal to a liberal civilization, for the inescapable consequence of their identification is either self-destruction, when heresies are punished as conspiracies, or destruction at the hands of their enemies, when conspiracies are tolerated as heresies.
>
> A heresy is a set of unpopular ideas or opinions on matters of grave concern to the community. The right to profess and advocate heresy of any character, including communism, is an essential element of a liberal society. The liberal stands ready to defend the honest heretic no matter what his views against any attempt to curb him. . . .
>
> A heresy does not shrink from publicity. It welcomes it. Not so a conspiracy. The signs of a conspiracy are secrecy, anonymity, the use of false labels, and the calculated lie. It does not offer its wares openly but by systematic infiltration into all organizations of cultural life, it seeks to capture strategic posts to carry out a policy alien to the purposes of the organizations. . . .

"Any and Every Sacrifice"

Prof. Hook then cites the instructions of Lenin as proof that the Communist movement—as distinct from the Communist ideas, per se—is a conspiracy. Lenin wrote, for instance, that "it is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice and even—if need be—resort to all sorts of strategems, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges . . . in order to carry on Communist work."

Having made clear the ground of his argument, Prof. Hook next examines the various attitudes current in regard to the Communist problem. First, the "frightened reactionaries," who cannot distinguish between a heresy and a conspiracy, but would indiscriminately destroy whatever presents itself as an unpleasant challenge to the status quo. Then there is the "small but influential" group of what we may call the legislative protectors of the Right, who believe that Communism can be checked by passing laws against it, and by requiring all individuals to take loyalty oaths. The faults of both these groups are self-evident, and do not seem to cause Prof. Hook nearly so much concern as do the "ritualistic" liberals who, he says, regard communism "merely as an unpleasant heresy, just a little worse than a crotchety theory of disease or finance." Ritualistic liberals—

> legitimately criticize the dangerous nonsense of those who proscribe heresy. But they carry their criticism to a point where they give the impression that the country is in the grip of a reign of terror or hysteria much more dangerous than Communist expansion from without and infiltration from within.

"REALISTIC LIBERALISM"

Against these three categories, Prof. Hook places that of the "realistic liberal," to whom he gives his support. The realistic liberal would take the position when faced with the Communist threat in government service that a superior loyalty to a foreign government disqualifies a citizen for service to his own, though in determining unreliability, "in some cases even past membership in a subversive organization is not conclusive." As regards communism in labor unions, Prof. Hook feels that the enlightened course is not government intervention, but that only an "aroused membership" can ensure free and independent trade unions.

As far as the schools are concerned, the realistic liberal must recognize that "for the scholar there are no subversive doctrines, but only those that are valid or invalid or not proved in the light of evidence." Naturally, one who submits to a "party line" has abrogated this principle of free and objective investigation, but since this is not a matter of politics nor of persecution, but of "ethical hygiene," it should be dealt with by the teachers themselves and not by the State or the Regents or the Board of Trustees.

Realistic Liberalism

Prof. Hook concludes his study with the recognition that problems must be faced with intelligence and not merely with pious rhetoric, and adds that realistic liberalism sees "that our greatest danger today is not fear of ideas but absence of ideas—specific ideas, addressed to concrete problems here and now, problems of such complexity that only the ignorant can be cocksure or dogmatic about the answers to them."

> Finally, liberalism conceives of life not in terms of bare survival or peace at any price but in the light of ideals upon which it is prepared to stake everything. Among these ideals are the strategic freedoms of the liberal American tradition which make the continuous use of intelligence possible.

"The Absence of Ideas"

Prof. Hook, we think, flourishes one important key to the problem with his statement concerning the *absence,* rather than the fear of ideas. At the risk of being sent to join the ranks of the frowned-on "ritualistic liberals," we cannot avoid pointing out that were the ideals of the "liberal American tradition" a living subject of thought and application with the American people, the threat of Communism, whether as an outright heresy or as a subversive conspiracy, could largely be discounted. What Prof. Hook tells us we must rely on to keep our labor unions free and independent is ultimately the only thing which can keep our nation so—an "aroused membership." We do not need to be roused to fear, for that results only in witch-hunting and loss of discrimination, but we do need to be aroused to a new consideration of the meaning and requirements of living in a free society.

One of the first of these requirements, as set forth by H. P. Blavatsky in her "heretical" journal, *Lucifer,* is "to fight prejudice, hypocrisy and shams in every nation, in every class of Society, as in every department of life." The man who would be free must place his trust in Truth itself, apart from any partial expression of it, and be ever ready to add to his stock whatever can prove itself true, and to discard whatever cannot meet that test. Were such an attitude current, there would exist neither the problem of fear of ideas, nor of their absence.

"In the Light of Ideals"

There is much with which to agree in Prof. Hook's examination of the problem, and little with which to quarrel, but in all justice, if we are to say that Communism needs to be stamped out *because it makes use of false labels and calculated lies,* we must perforce brand with the same iron any similar activity engaged in by our own or any other Government—and by any private organization. The maintenance of an espionage system cannot, on these terms, be condoned. We cannot, for example, justify the practice of sending bona fide FBI agents to infiltrate into Communist secret groups, for is this not the use of false labels and calculated lies? Or do we, at this point, drop the smooth front of impartiality and excuse these falsities and these lies because they are perpetrated in the service of *our* government in order to protect *us* from Danger?

We must recognize that as soon as we make the slightest compromise with the principle of conspiracy in our own activities, we give that much justification to the doctrine postulated by Lenin that the end "sanctifies" any means, and to that degree we undermine our own position. We must recognize that if we wish to find a truly righteous stand to take against Communism, it can only be on a platform of complete honesty and integrity, on a liberalism which makes no secret pacts with any form of totalitarian expediency. If we wish to solve the Communist problem "in the light of our ideals," we must make those ideals our sole guiding light, and give them our *unqualified* and "aroused" allegiance.

Soundings from Lemuria

The Los Angeles *Times* (Nov. 5) reports the findings of "Operation Midpac" in further substantiation of the general scientific belief —and the direct statement in Theosophical literature—that a continent once existed in the Pacific Ocean, to which the name Lemuria has been given. The expedition also confirmed the theosophical teaching, based on ancient Commentaries, that Lemuria was not submerged by flood, but was almost destroyed by volcanic action and then sunk (*Secret Doctrine,* I, 439 fn.; II, 141 fn.). Great quantities of ash were dredged up in the course of the operations, indicating widespread volcanic eruptions.

Operation Midpac was directed by the University of California's Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla, and by the U. S. Navy Electronics Laboratory at San Diego. The most dramatic discovery was that of a thousand-mile-long mountain range, peaks of which rise to a height of 14,000 feet, but are hidden a mile below the surface. This chain of mountains extends between Hawaii and Wake Island, linking together what were previously shown on navigating charts as isolated shoal points. According to the report, the tops of the mountains are flat, indicating that they were washed away by wave action when the peaks were still close to the surface. Clam, snail and sea urchin shells, together with reef coral, were dredged from the mile-deep summits, and since such coral grows normally only within 100 feet or so of the surface, it was calculated that peaks of the range were within a few feet of the surface some 40,000,000 years ago. This harmonizes with the theosophic chronology, since the *Secret Doctrine* places Lemuria "far back into the Secondary Age" (II, 710).

Ancient Bacteria

Recovered from beneath 20 feet of mud at the bottom of the ocean are bacteria which Dr. Roger Revelle, leader of the expedition, says may be millions of years old, preserved in a state of suspended animation. These bacteria, when brought to the surface and put on a culture medium, "became animated and grew with strength and vigor. They likely are the oldest living things in the world," Dr. Revelle is quoted as saying, and while Occult chronology may differ, it is nevertheless of interest to find corroboration of the old teaching quoted by H. P. Blavatsky (*S.D.* I, 439 fn.) that the "Third Earth"—Lemuria, the home of the Third Race—"went down into the lower Deep (the Ocean) . . . twice eighty-two cyclic years ago," this number of sidereal years coming to a total of over 4 millions of our years. Elsewhere, Lemuria is said to have "perished some 700,000 years before the commencement of the Tertiary or Eocene Age" (*S.D.* II, 313).

The Polynesian Legend

These findings provide a platform for the very old and very persistent Polynesian legend, chronicled by many scholars, of the existence of a vast continent in the Pacific. Wrote H. P. Blavatsky:

> It is our firm belief . . . that most, if not all, of the islands from the Malayan archipelago to Polynesia, are fragments of that once immense submerged Continent. Both Malacca and Polynesia, which lie at the two extremities of the ocean, and which, since the memory of man, never had, and never could have any intercourse with, or even a knowledge of each other, have yet a tradition common to all the islands and islets, that their respective countries extended far, far into the Sea: that there were in the world but two immense continents, one inhabited by yellow, the other by dark men; and that the Ocean, by command of the gods, and to punish them for their incessant quarrelling, swallowed them up. Notwithstanding the geographical proof that New Zealand, the Sandwich and Easter Islands, are at a distance from each other of between 800 and 1,000 leagues, and that, according to every testimony, neither these nor any other intermediate islands, for instance, the Marquesan, Society, Fiji, Tahitian, Samoan, and other islands, could, since they became islands, ignorant as their people were of the compass, have communicated with each other before the arrival of Europeans; yet they one and all maintain that their respective countries extended far toward the West, on the Asian side. Moreover, with very small differences, they all speak dialects evidently of the same language; and understand each other with little difficulty; have the same religious beliefs and superstitions; and pretty much the same customs. (*S.D.* II, 788.)

"KON-TIKI"

It should be noted that the distances once believed (as stated above) to be beyond traversing in a piroque (a dug-out canoe), have very recently been mastered by an adventurous Norwegian, Thor Heyerdahl, and five companions, using a balsawood raft built as an exact replica of those used by the natives in Peru and described by the Spanish explorers. Heyerdahl undertook the "preposterous" and dangerous voyage from Peru west across some 4,000 miles of uninhabited ocean to prove that it was quite possible that a similar voyage might have been made in the past, constituting a kind of mass migration to and settling of the Polynesian islands. The young Norwegian was endeavoring to give support to a theory he had evolved that all those islands had been populated by exiles from the Incan conquest of Peru, who had been led thence by a legendary chief called by the Incans "Virakocha" and by the Polynesians "Kon-Tiki" or "Illa-Tiki," all words meaning Sun or Fire King.

Heyerdahl cites Polynesian legends of white men who came across the ocean from the East, and taught the natives various arts and sciences. He places the first population of the South Sea islands about 500 A.D., and is of the opinion that the stone statues on Easter, Pitcairn and Marquesas Islands were constructed by this race of "white bearded strangers," thus explaining the similarity to those in Peru.

"Continent to the West"

Even supposing it possible that the fabulous Easter Island statues, classed as Lemurian remnants by the *Secret Doctrine,* could have been of such a recent origin (and reports are that the present inhabitants of the islands do not even have legends as to who their builders were), Mr. Heyerdahl's theory of the migration from Peru leaves much to be desired. His description and "demonstration" fail to account for the larger tradition common not alone to the local Polynesian group of islands, but to those of the Malayan archipelago, of a great continent that included all those islands and extended far into the West.

Certainly a reading of the history of the Atlanteans and the Lemurians, fragmentary though it is, in the *Secret Doctrine,* provides the student with many analogies and contrasts between the present and the past, and shows him that "moments of choice" neglected in those past ages return again and again, exhorting him, in Mr. Judge's words, to "Rise, Atlanteans [and Lemurians?], and undo the errors of the past. . . ."

Man Between Infinities

There was a time, a hundred, or even fifty years ago, when the conflict between science and religion was sufficiently clear-cut to almost guarantee that any man who seriously pursued the study of the one would spurn the approach and findings of the other. The man of science trusted to reason, and the man of religion placed all his stakes on the mystic number of revelation and faith. Science was still in that youthful stage in which the whole world lay open to her investigations and ripe for her conquest.

There are signs, however, that with the assumption of maturity, with the discovery that beyond the comfortable objective world of

matter lie the contrasting infinities of atom and space, science must add something to her previous dimension of purely human reason, if she is to combat effectively the placid dogmas of a church which has simply had to add infinity to the list of deific qualities in order to be quite up-to-date. One cannot comprehend the infinite with finite reason, the Church argues, quite irrefutably so far—so what other course is open to a man but faith in revelation?

"THE FIRST EXISTENTIALIST"

This proposal is the burden of an exposition on Pascal, the 17th-century mathematician and Christian philosopher, which appeared in the summer issue of the journal *Measure.* Karl Löwith, the author, entitles his article, "Man Between Infinities," and places Pascal as the "first Existentialist" of the modern age, the first to undertake the transition of the medieval Christian faith into terms which would accord with the requirements of the newly discovered Infinity of the Universe. Mr. Löwith defines the essential element of the existentialist philosophy as "the negative experience that man has no definite place and nature within the natural universe," and cites the current scientific theories of the nature of the cosmos to prove his point that all men are "existentialists" in the sense that they can no longer be said to reside in the classical universe of either Aristotle or St. Thomas Aquinas, where man had a "definite place and status in the hierarchy of an eternal or created cosmos." He continues:

> It is not a "failure of nerve" (as has been suggested) which brought Existentialism into existence. What failed us was not our nerve, but rather our belief in a divinely ordered universe in which man could feel himself at home, or *chez soi,* as it were. No social order of whatever kind, not even order plus freedom, can possibly make up for that lack of fundamental order in the universe. Hence, we have indeed "to be," or exist, in all those descriptive terms of sheer factuality, contingency, and absurdity which Existentialism has brought to light. For how can one feel at home in an "exploding" universe, the chance result of statistical probabilities? Such a universe cannot inspire confidence and sympathy, nor can it give orientation and meaning to man's existence in it. We are indeed cast into this world and therefore must postulate ourselves, having postulated such a universe with such unexpected success. . . . What makes us uncomfortable and throws

> us back upon ourselves is that our modern universe has no center and no limits. *As an infinite universe of indefinite limits, it has no definite place for a finite man.* (Italics ours.)

"MICROCOSM OF THE MACROCOSM"

To answer such bleatings from the "lost sheep" is at present beyond the capacity of physical science, though the growing respectability accorded by scientists to Dr. Rhine's extra-sensory investigations may be a point of departure in the future from which science may legitimately pursue the quest for an Infinite in man which will correspond to the Infinite in the universe. The theosophical doctrine, in its teaching that man is the microcosm of the macrocosm, provides a constant link between the human being and the world about him, since everything *in manifestation*—from the universe to the gnat and including the human form—exists alike in time, and must vanish in duration. Thus, the physical universe is no closer to being infinite than is physical man, but behind both *forms* lies the eternal, motionless Motion, the one Life-Essence which is the source and substratum of all manifestation. H. P. Blavatsky expounded the doctrine of Maya in the following way:

> Maya or illusion is an element which enters into all finite things, for everything that exists has only a relative, not an absolute, reality, since the appearance which the hidden noumenon assumes for any observer depends upon his power of cognition. To the untrained eye of the savage, a painting is at first an unmeaning confusion of streaks and daubs of colour, while an educated eye sees instantly a face or a landscape. Nothing is permanent except the one hidden absolute existence which contains in itself the noumena of all realities. . . . Whatever reality things possess must be looked for in them before or after they have passed like a flash through the material world; but we cannot cognise any such existence directly, so long as we have sense-instruments which bring only material existence into the field of our consciousness. (*S.D.* I, 39-40.)

"EXPLODING UNIVERSE AND ATOM"

Upon reflection on this concept of maya, or relative reality dependent on the instrument of perception used, we may more clearly evaluate the changing concepts of the universe which Mr. Löwith assures us have wrought such havoc in the human mind. For

actually, whether we consider the universe as a relatively limited, orderly hierarchy of beings, or as an almost infinitely extended cosmos of continually "exploding" atoms, these concepts *in themselves* are not of a nature to render the human being the victim of insecurity. What does victimize him is his ingrained and almost unconquerable penchant for what the ancients called the "Heresy of Separateness," that consequence of Ahankara, or selfhood, which causes him to see himself as separate and distinct from all other beings and things.

What is there to upset a man in the thought that he lives in an "exploding" universe, when he realizes that within his own form the same dynamic process is taking place, and that his body is, as science declares, the scene of a constant series of minute explosions? Once, then, the indestructible unity of the One Life behind all forms is grasped, it matters little, in one sense, what explanation we adopt for the "mayas" (on this plane) of universe, man and atom, for we will see that the law of analogy and correspondence holds true in every case, and links these three degrees of being firmly together.

"The radical unity of the ultimate essence of each constituent part of compounds in Nature—from Star to mineral Atom, from the highest Dhyan Chohan to the smallest infusoria, in the fullest acceptation of the term, and whether applied to the spiritual, intellectual, or physical worlds—this is the one fundamental law in Occult Science," states the *Secret Doctrine* (I, 120).

"Between the All and the Nothing"

It is of interest to compare the theosophical doctrine, which shows man to be in essence one with the Absolute (or the Infinite, in terms of our present discussion), with the best that Pascal could make of man in the Christian teaching. As Mr. Löwith summarizes his views, we are shown that—

> Man is a "seeming mean" between the two mathematical infinities, the infinitely great and the infinitely small, the Infinite and the Nothing of spatial and temporal extension. Or, to use an arithmetical analogy, man exists like a zero between an ever increasing and an ever decreasing series of numbers. . . . This position between two horizons of infinity is to Pascal analogous to the condition of man within the universe. Man exists between two fathomless infinities or "abysses." Between two such precipices, however, man

has no definable standpoint but rather his position is "floating." His position is the condition of a "seeming mean" between the All and the Nothing.

"An Impenetrable Secret"

Man in nature, Pascal wrote, is "A Nothing in comparison with the Infinite, an All in comparison with the Nothing, a mean between nothing and everything." Pascal then remarks, in his *Pensées,* that man, being infinitely removed from comprehending the extremes, "the end of things and their beginning are hopelessly hidden from him in an impenetrable secret":

> Through failure to contemplate these Infinities, men have rashly rushed into the examination of nature, as though they bore some proportion to her. It is strange that they have wished to understand the beginnings [principles] of things, and thence to arrive at the knowledge of the whole, with a presumption as infinite as their object. For surely this design cannot be formed without presumption or without a capacity infinite like nature. . . .

With this conclusion the theosophist will agree, but while the Christian will lay man's unquenchable search for first principles to presumption, he, on the other hand, will take Pascal's discarded hypothesis as the logical one, and say that the very fact that man can formulate the concept of infinity argues "a capacity infinite like nature."

"Christian Mediocrity"

Once Pascal convinced himself that there was nothing but presumption in man's yearning to embrace the Infinite, he settled himself to anchor man firmly to Mediocrity. It is significant that in putting forth this doctrine, he ignores the higher creative faculties of the human being, and bases his argument on the limitations of man's sense instrument:

> Limited as we are in every way, this state which holds the mean between two extremes is present in all our impotence. Our senses perceive no extreme. Too much sound deafens us; too much light dazzles us; too great distance or proximity hinders our view. Too great length and too great brevity of discourse tend to obscurity; too much truth is paralyzing. . . . Extreme qualities are prejudicial to us and not perceptible by the senses. . . . In short, extremes are for us as though they were not, and we are not within their notice. They escape us, or we them.

The conclusion which Pascal draws from this reflection is that as soon as man understands his "constitutional incapacity" to comprehend the infinities, "we shall remain at rest, each in the state wherein nature has placed him," concluding that "nothing is good but mediocrity. The majority has settled that and finds (sc. rightly) fault with him who escapes it at whichever end. . . . To leave the mean is to abandon humanity."

"OUR INFINITE FATHER . . ."

From which it is clear that while Christian theology has been forced to expand its concept of God to include infinity (while paradoxically maintaining his personal qualities), it has done nothing to expand the idea of the human being as correspondingly infinite in essence, but continues to offer him nothing more than the opportunity to kneel humbly on God's footstool. Certain it is that no matter how uncomfortable may be the scientist's "lonely" and "outcast" position in an "exploding" universe, he is capable of infinitely more than the man who is content to "remain at rest" in the narrow framework of Christian dogma. Pascal, we may remember, is commonly credited with the famous definition of God as an infinite sphere, "the center of which is everywhere, the circumference nowwhere." It is of interest and importance to note that, as H. P. Blavatsky points out in *The Secret Doctrine,* Pascal was not the originator of this concept, but merely borrowed it from more ancient sources, possibly Mercury Trismegistus. Pascal, she says (*S.D.* II, 545), not only borrowed the symbol, but disfigured it, making it refer to God in the Christian sense, instead of the original philosophical concept of the "Cosmic Circle." (See also *S.D.* I, 412.)

It is therefore not surprising that Mr. Löwith can arrive, under Pascal's direction, at the conclusion that "The greatness of man is proved by his wretchedness," and that "It is the Christian faith alone which can elucidate the combination of greatness and misery in the human condition," since "The Christian faith teaches us to attribute man's misery to his fallen nature and his greatness to grace." For answer, we may briefly quote Pascal himself, giving his remark, however, a meaning he did not intend: "Philosophers, they astonish ordinary men who are less educated; Christians, they astonish philosophers."

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS

DECLARATION

The policy of this Lodge is independent devotion to the cause of Theosophy, without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization. It is loyal to the great Founders of the Theosophical Movement, but does not concern itself with dissensions or differences of individual opinion.

The work it has on hand and the end it keeps in view are too absorbing and too lofty to leave it the time or inclination to take part in side issues. That work and that end is the dissemination of the Fundamental Principles of the philosophy of Theosophy, and the exemplification in practice of those principles, through a truer realization of the SELF; a profounder conviction of Universal Brotherhood.

It holds that the unassailable basis for union among Theosophists, wherever and however situated, is "similarity of aim, purpose and teaching," and therefore has neither Constitution, By-Laws nor Officers, the sole bond between its Associates being that basis. And it aims to disseminate this idea among Theosophists in the furtherance of Unity.

It regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization, and

It welcomes to its association all those who are in accord with its declared purposes and who desire to fit themselves, by study and otherwise, to be the better able to help and teach others.

"The true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect; yet belongs to each and all."

Being in sympathy with the purposes of this Lodge, as set forth in its "Declaration," I hereby record my desire to be enrolled as an Associate, it being understood that such association calls for no obligation on my part, other than that which I, myself, determine.

The foregoing is the form signed by Associates of the United Lodge of Theosophists. Inquiries are invited from all persons to whom this Movement may appeal. Cards for signatures will be sent upon request, and every possible assistance furnished Associates in their studies and in efforts to form local Lodges. There are no fees of any kind, and no formalities to be complied with. Write to:

GENERAL REGISTRAR, UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS,
Theosophy Hall, 33rd and Grand Ave., Los Angeles (7), Calif.

U. L. T. LODGES

AMSTERDAM, C. HOLLAND ..... Keizersgracht 411
BANGALORE CITY, INDIA ..... 15 Sir Krishna Rao Rd., Basavangudi
BERKELEY (4), CALIFORNIA ..... Masonic Temple Bldg., Bancroft and Shattuck
BOMBAY, INDIA ..... 51 Mahatma Gandhi Road
LONDON (W. 1), ENGLAND ..... 17 Great Cumberland Place
LONDON, ONTARIO, CANADA ..... 424 Richmond Street
LOS ANGELES (7), CALIFORNIA ..... 245 West 33rd Street
MATUNGA, BOMBAY (19), INDIA ..... Anandi Nivas, Bhaudaji Road
NEW YORK CITY (22) ..... 22 East Sixtieth Street
PARIS (5), FRANCE ..... 14 Rue de l'Abbé de l'Epée
PHILADELPHIA (3), PENNSYLVANIA ..... 1917 Walnut Street
PHOENIX, ARIZONA ..... 32 North Central Avenue
SACRAMENTO (14), CALIFORNIA ..... 1237½ H Street
SAN DIEGO (1), CALIFORNIA ..... 307 Orpheum Theatre Bldg., 524 B Street
SAN FRANCISCO (3), CALIFORNIA ..... 860 Pacific Bldg., 4th and Market Streets
SAN LEANDRO, CALIFORNIA ..... 1543 Morgan Avenue
SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA ..... Federation House, 166 Phillip Street
WASHINGTON (8), D. C. ..... 2653 Connecticut Ave., N. W.

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLICATIONS

Books by H. P. Blavatsky:

ISIS UNVEILED, a photographic facsimile of the Original Edition, the two volumes bound in one	$ 7.50
THE SECRET DOCTRINE, facsimile edition, two volumes in one	8.50
INDEX TO THE SECRET DOCTRINE, for students	3.00
THE SECRET DOCTRINE *and* INDEX	11.00
THE KEY TO THEOSOPHY, facsimile of Original Edition	3.00
THEOSOPHICAL GLOSSARY, facsimile of Original Edition	3.00
TRANSACTIONS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE	2.50
THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE	1.50

Books by William Q. Judge:

THE OCEAN OF THEOSOPHY	2.00
LETTERS THAT HAVE HELPED ME, new and enlarged edition	3.00
THE BHAGAVAD-GITA	1.50
NOTES ON THE BHAGAVAD-GITA	1.50
PATANJALI'S YOGA APHORISMS	1.50

Other Books:

THE FRIENDLY PHILOSOPHER, Letters and Talks by Robert Crosbie	3.00
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON THE "OCEAN," by Robert Crosbie	2.00
THE ETERNAL VERITIES, for children, new edition	2.00
TEACHER'S MANUAL AND GUIDE TO THE "ETERNAL VERITIES"	2.50
"BECAUSE—" FOR THE CHILDREN WHO ASK WHY	2.00
LIGHT ON THE PATH, written down by "M.C." (Bombay Ed.)	.75
THROUGH THE GATES OF GOLD, written down by "M.C."	1.50
OCCULT TALES, by H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge	2.00
FROM THE BOOK OF IMAGES, a volume of Indian tales	3.00

Pamphlets:

THEOSOPHY SIMPLY STATED (10 copies, 50 cents; 50 copies, $2.00)	.10
CONVERSATIONS ON THEOSOPHY, including the "Three Fundamental Propositions" of the Secret Doctrine	.10
REINCARNATION AND KARMA, containing the "Aphorisms on Karma" by Wm. Q. Judge	.10
THOUGHTS FOR THINKERS, a helpful essay	.10
WHAT IS DEATH?	.10
THE VOCATION OF LIFE	.10
THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS, a statement of its history, purpose and methods	.25
FIVE MESSAGES TO AMERICAN THEOSOPHISTS, by H. P. Blavatsky	.25
EPITOME OF THEOSOPHY, by William Q. Judge	.25
ECHOES FROM THE ORIENT, by William Q. Judge	.25
MORAL EDUCATION, new and enlarged edition	.50
A CHRISTIAN AND A THEOSOPHIST	.25
THE LAWS OF HEALING, Physical and Metaphysical	.50
STATES AFTER DEATH, and Spiritualistic "Communications" Explained	.35
CYCLES OF PSYCHISM, The Import of Psychic Evolution	.50
HYPNOTISM—A PSYCHIC MALPRACTICE	.25

Prices subject to change without notice

Correspondence, orders etc., should be addressed to

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles (7), California

22-24 East 60th Street, New York (22), New York